

**WILLIAMSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Tuesday, March 14, 2006**

CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

The regular semimonthly Architectural Review Board meeting was held on Tuesday, March 14, 2006, at 6:30 p.m. in the third Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Messrs. Edwards, Quarles, Lane, Klee, Hertzler and Spence. Staff members present were Zoning Administrator Murphy and Secretary Scott.

Consent Agenda

Chairman Williams explained the consent agenda procedure to the audience stating that if an application is in full compliance with the ***Design Review Guidelines***, it is placed on the consent agenda. If no member of the Board has any question regarding the application and concurs that it is in full compliance with the *Guidelines*, the audience is asked if they are present to discuss any case on the Consent Agenda. If there is no one in the audience present to discuss any item on the Consent Agenda, those applications are approved as submitted and the applicants are then free to leave the meeting.

Applications on tonight's Consent Agenda:

ARB #06-025 Chapin/313 Suri Drive – Exterior Change (windows)

ARB #06-027 Matthew Whaley School/301 Scotland Street – Temporary Classroom Trailer

ARB #06-028 Sobataka/708 Powell Street – Addition to single-family dwelling

ARB #06-029 CWF/309-E South England Street/Lap Pool Addition & Connection to Spa & Fitness Center

ARB #06-031 Chesapeake Bank/1225 Lafayette Street – New Office Building

SIGN #06-013 Joe's Souvenir Outlet/1665 Richmond Road – Monument face replacement & Building Mounted Signs

SIGN #06-014 Century 21/1001 Richmond Road – Freestanding face replacement

SIGN #06-016 CWF/The Peanut Shop/414 Prince George Street – Projecting & Building Mounted Signs

**SIGN #06-017 CWF/Smith Barney/437 West Duke of Gloucester Street –
Freestanding, Projecting & Building Mounted**

Neither the Board nor the audience had question or comment about the Consent Agenda cases. Mr. Hertzler moved and Mr. Lane seconded a motion to approve the cases on the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion carried by roll call vote as follows:

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Edwards, Quarles, Williams, Lane, Klee, Spence, Hertzler
Nay:	None
Abstain:	Spence, Edwards and Klee from ARB #06-029 and Signs #06-016 and #06-017
Absent:	None

ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT

**ARB #06-026 Saras/520 Newport Avenue – Exterior Change (Hardiplank to brick
siding for first floor of the new addition to single-family dwelling)
Approved with Conditions.**

Tony Saras, owner/applicant, stated the Board had given him some great suggestions at the ARB meeting several months ago, and he returns tonight for approval to amend the approved application to install brick rather than Hardiplank on the first floor of the addition. He added the change would be a purely aesthetic improvement.

Mr. Lane observed there is a brick ledge on the left but not on the right, however, Mr. Saras said he believes there is also a ledge on the right. Mr. Williams noted there is a brick skirt on the front. Mr. Klee asked what the plans are for transitioning from siding to brick and the reason why he is terminating the brick at that point. Mr. Saras responded there is currently no plan for the transition; however, he assured the Board it will be attractive. Mr. Saras said the cost of brickwork all the way up is a consideration, but in order to avoid another submittal, he would be willing to spend the money if the Board prefers.

Mr. Hertzler said he approves the proposal in principle and suggested the Zoning Administrator could review the transition method prior to application rather than the applicant needing to return to the Board. Mr. Saras reiterated his commitment to make the transition aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Williams moved the application be approved with the proviso that the applicant return to the Board with the transitioning details. He explained the transitioning is an important detail and suggested the applicant take advantage of the Board's expertise and advice. Mr. Spence seconded the motion which carried by roll call vote of 7-0.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Edwards, Quarles, Williams, Lane, Klee, Spence, Hertzler
Nay:	None
Absent:	None

CORRIDOR PROTECTION DISTRICT

ARB #06-030 Captain's Galley/1425 Richmond Road – Exterior Change (roof) – Tabled.

Owner/applicant, Angelo Mageras, was present to respond to any questions or comments the Board might have regarding his proposal to create a wall on the west elevation of the building for the location of a sign. He said he wants travelers to be able to see the sign on their way into town rather than once they have passed by the restaurant.

Board members' comments included the following:

- Mr. Williams noted the ***Design Review Guidelines*** state if there is a mansard roof it needs to be consistent on all sides.
- Mr. Hertzler said he thinks it would more advantageous to have the sign on the front of the building facing Richmond Road and more visible from the High Street project, but that's just a suggestion.
- Mr. Quarles clarified that the proposed change will be symmetrical even though on the rendering it doesn't appear so.
- Mr. Lane asked about mounting the signage directly on the building, but the applicant said it would be too low and not as visible.
- Mr. Hertzler commented that the information provided with this proposal is not adequate for what turns out to be more of a structural change than signage. Mr. Mageras said of course he wants to make the right changes, and requested to return to the Board with a rendering showing the whole side of the building with the symmetry demonstrated, pictures of the entire structure and appropriate measurements.

SIGNS

ARB

SIGN #06-011 Hampton Inn & Suites/911 Capitol Landing Road – Monument & Building Mounted Signs. Approved.

There was no one present at the meeting representing Hampton Inn & Suites. Zoning Administrator Murphy stated after review of the proposal for the 27 square feet monument sign and a 32 square feet building-mounted sign, staff recommends minor

conditions: that colors from the approved color chart, opaque "Light Navy" color for the background and "Deep Red" for the border, be used for the signage.

Mr. Williams moved the proposal be approved with the condition that the applicant uses the colors as recommended by staff, opaque "Light Navy" color for the background and "Deep Red" for the border. Mr. Hertzler seconded the motion which carried by roll call vote of 7-0.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Edwards, Quarles, Williams, Lane, Klee, Spence, Hertzler
Nay:	None
Absent:	None

SIGN #06-015 Golden Leaf Restaurant/1669 Richmond Road – Monument & Building Mounted Signs – Approved with Conditions.

Applicant Yan Guang Feng was present for questions or comments.

Zoning Administrator Murphy stated the request is to reduce the height of the Maple Tree Restaurant freestanding sign for a 32 square foot monument sign and to install a 16 square foot sign on the building. The new building-mounted sign will be located where the Maple Tree sign is currently located on the building. It will be internally illuminated with a geranium red background, dark yellow, yellow green border with white and geranium red lettering. The monument sign will have a white background with geranium red and yellow green lettering. The applicant proposes to reduce the height of the sign to eight feet with a pole cover to match the sign box.

Staff recommends the background of both signs be opaque with the height of the freestanding sign being reduced to eight feet with a black base the width of the sign covering the pole.

Mr. Williams said the *Design Review Guidelines* state light is to shine through the letters which permits the lettering to appear at night, not a glaring background. He also pointed out the applicant might want to change a couple of the words to the plural usage, i.e. groups and buses.

Mr. Williams moved the application be approved conditioned upon:

- the background being opaque, that only the lettering shine through;
- the monument sign meet the height requirements; and
- a black skirting on the base of the monument sign covering the pole.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye:	Edwards, Quarles, Williams, Lane, Klee, Spence, Hertzler
Nay:	None
Absent:	None

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Sign #06-010 Ripley's Believe It or Not/1735 Richmond Road – Surround for Monument Sign

Mary Sachse with John Hopke and Associates and sculptor Sue Landerman presented revisions to the surrounds for the monument signs. They stated there are two different signs because there are two tenants, the museum and the theatre.

Mr. Spence said he had hoped they would return with a simpler, more conventional design without quite so much carved brick. Mr. Edwards agreed with Mr. Spence.

Board members' comments included:

- Mr. Klee stated the revised surrounds are big improvements; the one with the mask is probably one he could support. Ms. Landerman noted the carved portion will show the body of the brick, and will be very subdued and subtle. She added that she stains the mortar joints so there is an easy flow with the brick.
- Mr. Lane agreed that the revisions are a big improvement and nowhere near as out of place as the previous submittal.
- Mr. Williams asked if the same artistic surround could be used for both signs; he said the *Design Review Guidelines* state the need for harmony and consistency. Mr. Quarles agreed the signs need to work together; maybe a different little logo on each, e.g. a gargoyle for the museum and a thespian for the theatre. Consensus of the Board was that variations on a common, conservative theme is the direction they would like the applicant to move. They asked that Ms. Landerman return with further revisions and possibly a model.

OTHER

Minutes for February 28, 2006

The minutes for the February 28, 2006 meeting were approved as submitted.

CedarMax Presentation

Representatives from Heartland, producers of a new vinyl siding product called CedarMax, talked with the Board regarding the properties of the thermal-backed siding and distributed samples of the product. They stated it is a very permanent product and the only negative is that it cannot be particularly successfully painted. The representatives said all that is needed for application is a flat surface. They stressed the need for certification for the siding installers and following the manufacturer's guidelines. There are numerous accessory options, in addition to the regularly shaped pieces.

The Board expressed they would like to see actual examples of the product and asked the representatives to get back to them with areas where the product has been used as well as the period of time it's been up.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Donna Dee Scott
Secretary